

May 25, 1965

specified for death, and the amounts specified for injuries, would be paid without regard to, and have no effect on, the damages recoverable under the Convention. In this respect, the insurance is comparable to regular commercial accident insurance, under which payments for losses are not normally offset against recoveries from tortfeasors.

The obligation to procure the insurance is imposed only on U.S. carriers for the reason that other countries might contend that an attempt to compel foreign carriers to provide the insurance would constitute a violation of this country's treaty obligations under the Warsaw Convention. Although the U.S. carriers may suffer a disadvantage with their foreign competitors because of being required to absorb the cost of the insurance, it believed that such insurance will in fact give the U.S. carriers a competitive advantage and that the foreign air carriers will find it desirable to procure similar insurance for passengers on segments of international journeys performed by them.

The legislation avoids a difficult administrative problem by requiring that in the event of death the proceeds of the insurance shall be paid to the passenger's personal representative for the benefit of designated individuals. In addition to avoiding the problem of attempting to give the passenger an opportunity to designate a beneficiary at the time of ticketing, the designation results in the same persons being beneficiaries as those for whose benefit an action for the death of the passenger may, as proposed in another section of the legislation, be brought under the Warsaw Convention.

The difficult problem of the issuance of policies to Warsaw passengers is avoided by requiring U.S. air carriers to provide such passengers with a statement in writing concerning the insurance, in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Board, as well as to display signs at ticket counters with respect to such insurance.

In addition to requiring U.S. air carriers to furnish written notice concerning the insurance, the legislation also requires such carriers to provide Warsaw passengers with a statement in writing concerning the limits of liability that may be applicable under the Warsaw Convention. Such carriers, as well as foreign air carriers maintaining ticket offices in the United States, would also be required to display signs at ticket counters advising of the limits of liability of the Convention.¹ There is practically unanimous

agreement inside and outside the Government that the present Warsaw notice appearing in small print on airline tickets is inadequate to advise passengers of the liability limit. In March 1964 the Civil Aeronautics Board amended its regulations to require air carriers and foreign air carriers to give improved notice to passengers of the limitation of liability under the convention in the form of a printed notice delivered with the ticket and a sign posted at the ticket counter. Notwithstanding this action by the Board, the notice provision in the legislation is considered desirable in order to make the improved notice by the carrier a statutory requirement rather than a matter of agency discretion, to assure that the Board has power to require notice of the insurance, and to make travel agents utilized by carriers in the United States directly responsible for giving the notice.

The provisions in the legislation to the effect that the Warsaw Convention shall be deemed to grant a right of action for bodily injury or death with respect to damage to which the convention relates is considered highly desirable in view of recent court decisions in this country indicating that no cause of action is created by the convention. As a result of these interpretations, it is possible that no suit could be brought under the convention unless a cause of action otherwise exists under the law of the forum or the place where the accident occurred. The legislation provides, therefore, that a civil action for damages under the convention may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction in the United States. Such an action, however, will be in place of all other rights which the injured person may have against persons liable under the convention. The right of action is vested in the injured person, or, in the event of his death, in his personal representative for the benefit of the surviving spouse and children, or, if none, for the parents, next of kin, or the estate, in that order.

There is attached a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes

Section 1. Amends section 101 of the act, containing definitions of the terms used therein, so as to include a definition of the term "Warsaw Convention." The term is

defined as meaning the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Transportation by Air signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929, or where applicable, the Warsaw Convention as amended at The Hague, 1955.

Section 2. Amends title IV of the act, relating to the economic regulation of air carriers, by adding a new section 418, entitled "Aviation Accident Insurance Requirements."

Subsection (a) of the new section requires air carriers holding certificates under title IV to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers engaged in journeys originating or terminating in the United States subject to the Warsaw Convention who suffer accidental injury or death while being transported by such carriers. Evidence must be submitted to the Board within 6 months after the date of enactment of the section that insurance has been obtained which complies with the requirements of the section. Air carriers transporting passengers under charter agreements with the Department of Defense are exempted from the insurance requirements in those instances where the entire capacity of the aircraft is reserved to the Department by the agreements. Charters of this character provide for higher limits of liability for bodily injury or death than those in the Warsaw Convention.

Subsection (b) requires that the insurance provide that \$50,000 will be paid for the death of any passenger over 12 years of age, and \$25,000 for the death of any other passenger. Specified amounts, ranging from \$15,000 to \$50,000, would be paid for designated bodily injuries, including total disability, with a maximum total payment of \$50,000 for injury and death. Additional payments not in excess of \$10,000 would be made for medical expenses, as they accrued, directly to the individual or medical facility (including a facility of the U.S. Government) providing the services for which the expenses were incurred. Sums due at death would be payable to the personal representative for the benefit of the surviving spouse and children, or, if none, for the parents, next of kin, or the estate, in that order. Actions to recover on the insurance would have to be brought not later than 3 years from the date of the accident. An action for death would have to be brought by the personal representative for the benefit of the same classes of persons for whose benefit sums due at death would be payable.

Subsection (c) makes it unlawful for an insurance company to attempt to be subrogated to any rights of recovery which a passenger may have, and declares any agreement for such to be null and void. However, the insurance company would not be precluded from exercising any subrogation rights which it might have as the result of payments under insurance which was not procured pursuant to the section.

Subsection (d) requires that insurance premiums be paid by the air carrier procuring the insurance. Payment of such a premium would not provide a basis for the reduction of damages otherwise recoverable from the carrier.

Subsection (e) requires the Board to immediately enter upon a hearing for the purpose of determining whether an air carrier's certificate should be modified, suspended, or revoked where it has reason to believe that a carrier has failed to comply with the provisions of the section, or any regulation or order issued thereunder. The subsection specifically provides that the Board shall not

¹ The provisions of the new sec. 419 requiring notice are intricate and lengthy. The effect of the section can be illustrated in the following table, in which the letters represent the subsections and paragraphs authorizing the Board to prescribe the appropriate notice.

	Warsaw notice		Insurance notice	
	Written notice *	Sign on counter *	Written notice *	Sign on counter *
Air carriers:				
In the United States:				
At own offices	(a)(1)	(a)(2)	(b)(1)	(b)(1)
At agents' offices	(a)(1)	(c)(1)	(b)(1)	(c)(1)
Outside the United States:				
At own offices	(a)(1)	(a)(2)	(b)(1)	(b)(1)
At agents' offices	(a)(1)		(b)(1)	

No. 94—6

	Warsaw notice		Insurance notice	
	Written notice *	Sign on counter *	Written notice *	Sign on counter *
Foreign air carriers:				
In the United States:				
At own offices		(a)(2)		
At agents' offices		(c)(2)		
Outside the United States:				
At own offices				
At agents' offices				

* Form and contents to be prescribed by the Board.

May 25, 1965

be precluded from imposing a civil penalty for such a violation.

Section 3. Amends title IV of the act by adding a new section 419, entitled "Notice of Limits of Liability and Aviation Accident Insurance."

Subsection (a) of the new section requires air carriers delivering tickets for journeys originating or terminating in the United States subject to the Warsaw Convention to furnish at the time of such delivery a statement in writing, in form and manner approved by the Board, concerning the monetary limits of liability for death or bodily injury, and other limitations, that may be applicable under the Convention. Such air carriers would also have the responsibility for seeing that such a statement was delivered by their ticket agents and other agents. Both air carriers and foreign air carriers, maintaining locations in the United States for the sale of tickets, would be required to display at locations for the sale of tickets, such notice as might be prescribed by the Board concerning such limits of liability. Notices presently furnished pursuant to the Convention do not contain the monetary limits of liability, nor does the Convention require that notices concerning the limits of liability be displayed at locations for the sale of tickets.

Subsection (b) requires air carriers delivering tickets for journeys originating or terminating in the United States subject to the Warsaw Convention not only to furnish at the time of such delivery a statement prescribed by the Board concerning the insurance provided pursuant to section 418, but also to cause to be displayed at locations maintained by them for the sale of tickets such notice concerning the insurance as may be prescribed by the Board. As in the case of the statements concerning the limits of liability under the Warsaw Convention, the air carriers would have the responsibility for seeing that their ticket agents and other agents furnished statements concerning the insurance.

Subsection (c) requires ticket agents and other agents in the United States, unless exempted by the Board, to display notices prescribed by the Board concerning both the limits of liability under the Warsaw Convention and the insurance when acting for air carriers, and to display notices concerning the limits of liability under the Convention when acting for foreign air carriers.

Section 4. Amends title IV of the act by adding a new section 420, entitled "Inapplicability of State Laws."

The new section provides that the provisions of sections 418 and 419, and regulations of orders issued thereunder, shall be applicable notwithstanding any State or local laws, ordinances, or regulations, which are inconsistent therewith. Practically all insurance companies are subject to rules or regulations of various State commissions, and the provision is designed to make certain that such rules and regulations will not impair the ability of the insurance companies to provide the insurance which air carriers would be required to procure under this legislation.

Section 5. Amends section 1106 of the act, providing that nothing contained therein shall abridge remedies existing at common law or by statute, by adding provisions declaring that the Warsaw Convention shall be deemed to grant a right of action for bodily injury or death. A civil action for damages, with the right of trial by jury, could be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction in the United States by an injured person, or, in the event of death, by his personal representative for the benefit of designated individuals. Such an action would be in place of all other rights which the injured person, or his representative, might have, at common law or under statute, against persons liable under the Convention for bodily

injury or death. Contributory negligence would not be a bar to recovery, but the damages that would have been recoverable in the absence of the limits of liability of the Convention would be diminished in proportion to the degree of negligence attributable to the injured person. The damages awarded could not exceed the limits of the Convention, and would be apportioned by the court among the persons for whose benefit the action was brought in proportion to the loss they may have suffered as a result of the death of the decedent. An additional amount for reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, and other expenses of litigation would have to be allowed by the court whenever permitted by the Convention.

Section 6. Amends portions of the table of contents contained in the first section of the act so as to reflect the amendments made to title IV and to section 1106.

DESIGNATION OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AS A COMBAT ZONE FOR FEDERAL TAX PURPOSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the purpose of which is to designate the Dominican Republic as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes with respect to armed services personnel serving in that area.

Under Executive Order No. 11216 issued by the President of the United States recently, armed services personnel serving in South Vietnam are exempted from payment of Federal income tax, on the basis of the fact that this area is considered a combat zone for such purposes.

I have no quarrel with Executive Order No. 11216. As a matter of fact, I commend the President for taking action along this line.

I feel, however, that those of our armed service personnel in the Dominican Republic crisis on or after April 28, 1965, should have equal treatment accorded them and to continue until such time as the President declares the termination of combatant activities.

As of May 17, 1965, the Department of Defense pointed out that 18 members of our Armed Forces have been killed and 93 wounded in the Dominican Republic. Their service in behalf of the United States and the cause of freedom has, in my opinion, the same degree of importance as those of our Armed Forces serving elsewhere. The purpose of my proposal is to provide equality of treatment to members of our Armed Forces serving in both areas.

I feel confident that our President would look with favor on the proposed legislation or extending the Executive order, which would accomplish the same result. Certainly, our Armed Forces personnel in the Dominican Republic, protecting American interests and the cause of freedom against the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere, are performing outstanding service for their country and should be entitled to the same treatment as those of our Armed Forces serving in South Vietnam.

I sincerely trust that the proposed bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2034) to designate the Dominican Republic as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 208

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute—No. 124—proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD—for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN—to the bill, S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table, and that they be considered as read for the purposes of cloture. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendments be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the explanations accompanying the amendments will be printed in the Record.

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 208 is as follows:

The purpose of this amendment is to reduce from 25 to 20 percent the figure currently used in subsection 4(b)(3). The effect of this amendment would be to release from potential coverage five of the seven Arkansas counties which have registered more than 20 percent of their nonwhite population of voting age.

These five counties, and the percentage of nonwhites registered are: Cross, 23.1 percent; Independence, 23.4 percent; Lee, 24.1 percent; Poinsett, 23.3 percent; and Pope, 24.3 percent.

AMENDMENT NO. 209

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 209, submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, is as follows.

The purpose of this amendment is to eliminate the additional 25 percent triggering device added to the bill during executive sessions. Based on figures supplied by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, seven counties in Arkansas would be covered by this new provision.

That this 25 percent figure was deliberately contrived in the numbers games played by the sponsor of this amendment is clear from the fact that of the seven Arkansas counties covered by this provision, five have registered more than 23 percent of their nonwhite population.

Mr. President, we want our people in Arkansas to register and vote but I do not believe that we should compel people to vote.

Even the Civil Rights Commission reported as long as 4 years ago that there are no significant racial barriers to voting in my State. That being the case I cannot understand why the sponsor of this amendment is so bent on castigating a State that is trying to do a good job.

We have a new and simple registration law in Arkansas, and I would like to see my people afforded the opportunity to test its adequacy without Federal interference.

I was, of course, heartened by the adoption of an amendment sponsored by the junior Senator from Arkansas and myself, which would suspend the power to appoint examiners in Arkansas under this bill for a period of time, but I would be even more pleased to have this entire section stricken from the bill.

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2655

nological success, as was demonstrated just hours before Khrushchev's downfall by the 24-hour orbiting of the earth by a three-man Soviet spacecraft. Swift progress in the sciences and engineering can be expected to continue. Whether intensified progress in educating all of the Soviet people will result in their demanding greater freedom of action and expression remains highly speculative.

Konstantin Simonov, former head of the Soviet Journalists' Union, novelist, playwright, and poet, quoted to me an epigram of the playwright Anatoli V. Sofronov: "Information is the mother of intuition."

I instantly agreed and asked him how the United States could get more information into the Soviet Union. When would U.S. newspapers, magazines, and books be sold freely in his country? Is there hope that the time will come when the Soviet Government will cease to shut off its people from the free flow of information from the United States and the West?

"An important factor that divides the United States and the U.S.S.R. is the great difference in living standards," Simonov replied obliquely. "Now the gap is decreasing. This makes exchanges easier. We are less afraid now to send our people to the United States. The psychological problem isn't as great as it was. Five or ten years from now, as the gap closes, it will be still easier." Thus he seemed to suggest that it will also be easier to reduce the barrier to the flow of information. However, he then went on to say that the freedom of the press as it is practiced in the United States has served as a damper on the development of freedom of expression in the Soviet Union. Our U.S. press, he suggests, far from demonstrating the values of freedom, demonstrates the evils. He reminded me of Mme. Roland's famous exclamation, "O Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name!"

I tried to explain to him, as I have at many an international conference, that even though freedom of the press might occasionally involve abuses, it is, on balance, the only possible force that can control its own excesses; that we in the United States did not believe any person or group is qualified to regulate the press; and that diversity of opinion, freely expressed, is our greatest strength.

My trip in May included not only talks with Alexei Adzhubel, then chief editor of Izvestia and a former editor of Komsomolskaya Pravda, but with Nikolai Inozemtsev, foreign editor of Pravda, Nikolai Polianov, a top observer for Izvestia, and Georgi Zhukov, a senior observer for Pravda. However, aside from my dialog with Simonov, I engaged in little discussion of the Soviet press as such. Like every other form of communication in the U.S.S.R., the Soviet press, both daily and periodical, is totally an instrument of party propaganda. As I reported in the 1956 Book of the Year, it is by Western standards, unbelievably dull. I shall not again report on the Soviet press here, nor on literature and the theater which, though they are also instruments of total propaganda, are far less dull. One point, however, is worth noting: because of the absorption of the press with propaganda—and, of course, because of the constant propaganda of the Communist Party, the Komsomols for youth, and the Young Pioneers for youngsters—the schools have been relieved in considerable degree of the pressure to propagandize, and are largely free to concentrate on intellectual development.

As I view retrospect the events of a momentous year, and the talks I have had in the past with Soviet leaders, it appears even more certain to me today than ever before that the struggle between freedom and communism is a battle of brainpower in which all citizens, not merely scientists and engineers, are engaged.

We still do not know what changes will result from Khrushchev's fall from power. More than 2 years ago, Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University, said, "It is misleading to assume that Khrushchev * * * would be replaced by a Stalinist successor. The changes that have taken place in Russia since Stalin's death are very profound and Stalinism as a form of government is most unlikely to return."

He recommended that the United States, while yielding nowhere to Soviet pressure, should encourage fraternization of U.S. citizens with Soviet leaders. Exchanges of personal visits, common appearances on television, at some point even good-will visits by heads of state, he maintained, can serve freedom's cause, and "there is no reason why the West could not be the initiator of such contacts and exchanges."

He observed, "Today, the Communist world is facing a mounting ideological debate with many Communists engaging in sincere self-doubt and criticism. The dilemma which many of them face, however, is that there appears to be no alternative to their existing socioeconomic and political system. The West should join in this dialog * * * suggestions should stress the compatibility of socialism and pluralism, of national ownership and personal freedom, and should try to stimulate a dialog concerning the future development of Communist societies."

With these views I concur. Indeed, ever since serving as Assistant Secretary of State right after the war, I have been promoting similar ideas. The U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Foy Kohler, recently stressed to me that Soviet leaders, in seeking for more trade and in agreeing to more exchanges of persons with the United States, have at least two objectives in mind: (1) to get as much of our technology as possible; and (2) to give their people and ours and the people of the world the impression that their purposes are wholly peaceful and benign. By contrast, what is our objective? Ambassador Kohler put it simply and well: "To open up the Soviet society." To accomplish this, we must, in my view, seek every form of reasonable exchange with the Soviet Union. We must keep coming back.

President Johnson has committed himself to an intensive personal campaign to break down East-West antagonisms, and he has repeatedly pledged his willingness to go anywhere in the world to discuss policies with foreign leaders when he thinks this will contribute to peace. Clearly he hopes to find new means and to strengthen old means of building "bridges" between the Western democracies and the Soviet bloc and thus permanently easing international tensions. This is a hope that I, and many millions of others in the world, fully share. Indeed, this was one of the major issues on which the American people voted last November. They voted for the effort to build the bridges. But I suspect they share also, as I do, President Johnson's caution. As he has expressed it, "I will keep my hand out, and my guard up."

Dominican Republic: Order Out of Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been most pleased by recent press reports that the Organization of American States has determined to undertake

peace-keeping operations in the Dominican Republic in an attempt to help bring order out of chaos in that strife-torn country.

Reflecting the chaotic state of affairs in the Dominican Republic has been the conflicting information which has reached the United States about the struggle there.

I was pleased to note, therefore, a May 21 editorial in the Milwaukee Journal which attempts to untangle the situation somewhat by providing a "cast of principals" in the crisis.

Because I believe this rundown is a valuable reference guide, I include it at this point:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 21 1965]

ON STAGE IN SANTO DOMINGO

Each day's events in the Dominican Republic seem only to add to the confusion. In an attempt to help disentangle some of the recent events, here is a cast of principals:

Juan Bosch, elected President in December 1962, with a 60-percent majority and overthrown on September 25, 1963. Restoration as head of a constitutional government was original purpose of rebel forces. Appears now to have stepped aside. Denies his supporters have ever been Communist influenced as the United States charged.

Donald Reid Cabral, head of the ruling civilian junta when revolt started April 24, presumably because of his intention of shaking up the military high command. Kept in custody for 72 hours, then released. Appears to have had no part in the civil war.

Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, leader of original revolt which developed two factions and turned into civil war. Son of one of former Dictator Trujillo's more notorious army officers. Elected by a rump session of Congress as provisional President with Bosch's blessing and claims to be the legitimate successor to Bosch. United States charged that in early stages of revolt his movement was Communist controlled.

Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, head of five man civilian-military junta which calls itself "national government for reconstruction." One of two survivors of plotters who assassinated Trujillo in 1961. Claims "absolute control" of the country and insists he will accept no compromise. Rejects U.S. efforts to form a coalition, saying that to admit Caamano elements into a government would be to let in Communists.

Antonio Guzman, agriculture minister under Bosch. Backed by the United States to head a proposed coalition.

Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, leader in the overthrow of Bosch and participant in Reid's ouster. Set up three man military junta which later was replaced by the Imbert military-civilian junta. Under U.S. pressure, promised to resign from armed forces in a move to reach a negotiated settlement but later changed his mind.

The United States, President Johnson ordered 400 marines to Santo Domingo on April 28 to evacuate American citizens. Troops strength has since grown to more than 21,000. Their activities have tended, successively, to support Wessin, Imbert and now Guzman. The Johnson administration charged about a week after the civil war began that Bosch-Caamano forces were controlled by Communists, but in switching support to Guzman claimed that our intervention had driven Red elements out of positions of influence.

Organization of American States, after endorsing U.S. intervention as necessary, sent a five-man commission to work for cease fire but it has had little success. Group has returned to Washington, charging efforts were undermined by the United States and the United Nations. Its secretary general,

May 25, 1965

Jose A. Mora, remains instructed to mediate conflict.

United Nations, Secretary General Thant, on unanimous resolution of the security council, sent personal representative, Jose Antonio Mayobre of Venezuela, to Santo Domingo to work for cease fire and peace. Efforts so far appear fruitless.

It is my belief that only time will provide the answers to all the questions which arise about the civil disturbance in the Dominican Republic. The American people know that President Johnson is doing his best to act prudently and wisely in a difficult situation.

Their support has been expressed editorially in a number of papers around the country, including the Milwaukee Sentinel, the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union and the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel. Editorials from these newspapers follow: [From the Milwaukee Sentinel, May 21, 1965]

KINGMAKING—UNITED STATES INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME

Whether the United States likes it or not, Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera, junta president, seems to have emerged as the ruler of the Dominican Republic.

Spurning U.S. efforts to form a coalition government, Imbert is pressing for an unconditional surrender of the rebels. "We have absolute control," he says. "We" must include the American marines, for without their timely intervention the rebel forces might well be the ones claiming absolute control by now. Understandably enough, therefore, Washington is taking keen interest in who will rule the Dominican Republic once order is restored.

Nonofficial reports indicate that the American Government regards Imbert as far from being the ideal one to lead the Dominicans away from the wilderness of communism and into the promised land of democratic freedom.

It is a good time for the United States to reflect a moment on our record of picking horses. Diem offended us, and we quit backing him, at the price of increased grief in South Vietnam ever since.

Tshombe outlived our ostracism to return to the Congo, where he is winning grudging admiration from his erstwhile critics by beginning to bring some order out of chaos.

Imbert, or whoever eventually takes over the reins of free Dominican leadership, may not be all we would like. But it is vain to hope that ideal leadership is to be found. The best we can hope is that the power doesn't fall into the hands of someone who will turn out to be a Castro.

The most promising way to realize this hope would seem to be to quit running down possible leaders on our side or, worse yet, trying to press them into making deals with the Communist-backed side.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, May 3, 1965]

AS WE SEE IT: UNITED STATES ACTS TO BEAT REDS TO PUNCH IN CARIBBEAN

"We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all," said President Johnson in his state of the Union message, "but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests, our citizens, or our establishments abroad."

This sums up the reasons why the President braved a storm of international protests and sent U.S. troops to the Dominican Republic.

The initial reason for this "gunboat diplomacy" was the immediate danger to U.S. citizens. But a broader policy is involved, as Mr. Johnson explained yesterday.

From bitter experience in Cuba, the United States has learned that it is a thousand times easier to prevent a Castro-Communist type of government than it is to get rid of one after it has been established.

The Red threat in Santo Domingo was clear enough to persuade the President of the need for quick, direct action to frustrate those who would use anarchy as a means of establishing another Communist outpost in the Caribbean.

It would be better, of course, if the Organization of American States were able to protect innocent victims of such a rebellion and to prevent a Red takeover.

But it is not. And years of ineffective OAS attempts to get rid of Castro have taught the United States that it must rely on its own resources in this kind of emergency.

Perhaps the OAS will find a means of restoring order and thwarting the Communists in the Dominican Republic. Certainly President Johnson hopes so, for he has quite enough to cope with in Vietnam and elsewhere without still another crisis.

Failing that, however, he has had to choose the best—or more accurately, the least risky—of several distasteful alternatives.

He decided again to serve notice that the United States will not permit its hands to be tied by diplomatic niceties while the Communists fill a power vacuum.

Those who call for a different approach ignore the harsh realities of the dangerous and tense world of today. For if the United States does not act decisively in such cases, it will find itself defeated by forces which have no hesitation in acting with utter ruthlessness when it serves their purpose.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Apr. 29, 1965]

SENDING THE MARINES

President Johnson's timely action in sending U.S. Marines to protect U.S. citizens in a friendly neighboring country torn by armed strife is well taken—as is his urgent new plea for warring factions within the Dominican Republic to cease fire.

The President ordered the Marines into the island Republic only after new fighting had broken out and Dominican military authorities advised that U.S. military aid was needed to guarantee the safety of American citizens.

The political situation within the Dominican Republic remains unclear. The Dominican Ambassador to the Organization of American States contends efforts to overthrow the Government were the "finalization of Communist plans to make the Dominican Republic a second Cuba."

Although our troops are charged only with the safety of U.S. citizens and other foreign nationals who ask protection, perhaps their presence also will exert a stabilizing influence and help encourage the restoration of peace and order among our friends in the Caribbean. We hope so.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent; *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.